

Durham Research Online

Deposited in DRO:

31 August 2016

Version of attached file:

Accepted Version

Peer-review status of attached file:

Peer-reviewed

Citation for published item:

Howlett, C. and Hill, R.A. (2017) 'Can zoo enclosures inform enclosure design for crop-raiding primates? A preliminary assessment.', *African journal of ecology*, 55 (4). pp. 727-730.

Further information on publisher's website:

<https://doi.org/10.1111/aje.12372>

Publisher's copyright statement:

This is the accepted version of the following article: Howlett, C. and Hill, R. A. (2017), Can zoo enclosures inform enclosure design for crop-raiding primates? A preliminary assessment. *African Journal of Ecology*, 55(4): 727-730, which has been published in final form at <https://doi.org/10.1111/aje.12372>. This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance With Wiley Terms and Conditions for self-archiving.

Additional information:

Use policy

The full-text may be used and/or reproduced, and given to third parties in any format or medium, without prior permission or charge, for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes provided that:

- a full bibliographic reference is made to the original source
- a [link](#) is made to the metadata record in DRO
- the full-text is not changed in any way

The full-text must not be sold in any format or medium without the formal permission of the copyright holders.

Please consult the [full DRO policy](#) for further details.

Can zoo enclosures inform enclosure design for crop-raiding primates? A preliminary assessment.

Caroline Howlett^{1,2,3*} and Russell A. Hill^{1,2}

*Author for correspondence.

1. Durham University, Dawson Building, South Road, Durham, DH1 3LE, UK; r.a.hill@durham.ac.uk; Tel: 0191 334 1601.

2. Primate & Predator Project, Lajuma Research Centre, P.O. BOX 522, Louis Trichardt, Limpopo Province, 0920, South Africa.

3. School of Anthropology and Conservation, Marlowe Building, The University of Kent, Canterbury, Kent, CT2 7NR, UK; ch616@kent.ac.uk.

Key words: human-wildlife conflict, prevention, method, conservation.

Running title: Crop-raiding fence BO zoo enclosure design

Word count: 1998 including title and author information but excluding tables, figures and reference list.

Abstract

Crop raiding by wild primates is an issue affecting farming communities in many parts of the world and resulting economic losses and food insecurity can cause resistance to conservation efforts. A wide variety of methods have been employed to reduce the amount of crops lost to primate species with varying degrees of success. We tested the effectiveness of a fence design commonly used in captive settings to keep primates inside zoo enclosures, to determine if it could keep primates out of an enclosed area in a wild setting. We built three enclosed areas (exclosures) of different heights in the Soutpansberg Mountains of South Africa. The area was visited by both habituated and non-habituated chacma baboon (*Papio ursinus*) groups on an almost daily basis. In all cases the primates attempted but were unable to reach the bait inside the exclosure through scaling the fence, with habituated animals making more attempts than groups less exposed to humans and human infrastructure. The experiment indicates that zoo enclosure designs could be effective in excluding wild primate species from food sources. These positive small-scale results call for a field-scale trial of this design to be carried out to determine its suitability for large-scale crop protection.

Introduction

Crop raiding by wildlife is one of the major causes of human-wildlife conflict in Africa with many primate species cited as problematic (Naughton-Treves, 1998; Hill, 2000; Hoffman & O’Riain, 2012; Healy & Nijman, 2014). Primates are intelligent, opportunistic animals and baboons (*Papio* spp) have non-specialised omnivorous diets (Hill, 2000) that allow them to adapt quickly to living alongside humans and exploiting human food resources (Hill, 2000). Crops, in particular, can provide wild primates with an alternative and accessible food source

(Hill & Wallace, 2012). Since group sizes of raiding species such as baboons can exceed seventy individuals, the effect of a single raid on a crop field can have devastating effects for farmers (Hill, 2000).

Research into crop raiding prevention has shown that it is a complex issue requiring mitigation methods to be tailored toward specific species and situations (Saraswat, Sinha & Radhakrishna, 2015). Farming practises can be adapted to reduce crop damage by wildlife through planting unpalatable crops, planting buffer zones of highly palatable crops to protect main crops or leaving land fallow (McGuinness & Taylor, 2014). Alternative methods employed by farmers to prevent crop losses range from noise-making scaring devices, net wires, scarecrows, trenches, biofences (Thapa, 2010), reflective prisms (Kaplan & O'Riain, 2015), spraying chilli grease around farm boundaries (Sitati & Walpole, 2006), as well as poison, snares, traps (Naughton-Treves, 1998) and lethal removal of problem animals (McGuinness & Taylor, 2014). Many methods tend to have only temporary success, with raiding wildlife driven away initially but subsequently returning to raid crops (Thapa, 2010).

Active guarding by people and guard animals (McGuinness & Taylor, 2014) and improved fencing are mitigation methods shown to be effective in reducing crop raiding damage in the long term (Hill, 2000; Hill & Wallace, 2012; Karanth, Naughton-Treves, & Gopalaswamy, 2013). Active guarding is time consuming and labour intensive for farmers (Thapa, 2010) and can impose social costs on communities where children are needed to guard crop fields when they would otherwise be attending school (Linkie *et al.* 2007). Fences provide protection for crops against damage by wildlife but their use is often limited by the costs of construction and maintenance (McGuinness & Taylor, 2014; Hill & Wallace, 2012; Thapa, 2010). Where fences are employed, their heights (most often between 1-1.5m) may be sufficient to exclude animals such as porcupine (*Hystrix africaeaustralis*) and pig species (*Phacochoerus africanus*, *Potamochoerus larvatus*), but are not always effective in excluding primates which

can climb and larger ungulates that can jump over the fence (Thapa, 2010). Increasing the height of a farm's barbed wire fence resulted in an 80% reduction in maize damage by primates in Uganda (Wallace & Hill, 2012), while electric fencing has also been used by farmers with some success to deter primates. This is an expensive, maintenance-heavy option (Thouless & Sakwa, 1995), however, and not available to many subsistence farmers living in rural locations. Additionally, electric fences also pose high risks to other, non-target wildlife species (Beck, 2010).

Here we tested whether a fence design typically employed in preventing captive primates escaping zoo enclosures (Figure 1) could be used to prevent wild primates from accessing food. If successful, the design would improve on existing physical barriers with little additional maintenance and labour costs, whilst reducing the financial costs and wildlife damages associated with electric fences.

(Figure 1)

Methods

The trials were conducted at the Lajuma Research Centre in the Soutpansberg Mountain Range, South Africa (23°02'23"S & 29°20'05"E). The climate is temperate-mesothermal with vegetation types including forest, grassland and savannah biomes (Mostert *et al.* 2008). Several wild chacma baboon (*Papio ursinus*) groups are present at the site with one group fully habituated to human observers. We thus had the potential to determine the effectiveness of the fence design on both habituated and non-habituated groups; this is important as habituated animals may be more relaxed around man-made structures and so are more willing to enter farmland and spend more time trying to gain access to food.

1 We built three triangular exclosures (3mx3mx3m) of three different heights (2m, 3m, 3.5m)
2 in an open bushveld area (30m from the forest edge) known to be frequented by a number of
3 baboon groups (Figures 2a-c). We used wire mesh (squares 5cm²) and eucalyptus poles
4 topped with a barrier of sheet metal (1m high and 0.5mm thick). The metal sheeting was
5 attached to horizontal poles that were mounted on brackets fixed to the tops of the vertical
6 poles. This held the barrier 30cm away from the sides of the exclosure to create an overhang
7 (Figure 2a). Wire mesh wrapped over the horizontal poles and fixed to the sides of the
8 exclosures closed any gaps between the fencing and the barrier. We chose a height of 1m for
9 the barrier as this exceeded the arm reach of the baboons. 0.5m of the barrier extended above
10 the fence line and 0.5m hung below (Figures 2a and b) as in zoo enclosure designs (Figure 1a
11 and b). Although it is common practise to bury fences 0.5-1m deep in the ground to deter
12 burrowing species, the rocky terrain in the test area made this difficult. For the purposes of
13 our experiment we buried the mesh just 10cm deep and surrounded the base of the fence with
14 rocks.

15 We baited each exclosure with twelve oranges piled in the centre beyond the reach of the
16 baboons from the sides (Figure 2c). A pair of motion-activated Bushnell® Trail cameras
17 (Trophy, model, 2010, Non Typical Inc., USA) were positioned on opposite sides of each
18 exclosure to capture video footage of all animal visits. Videos were downloaded and
19 reviewed daily at 18:00h with all visits from primates and other animals and their outcomes
20 recorded by the first author. The habituated baboon group was distinguished from the non-
21 habituated groups through identification of known individuals. We tested the effectiveness of
22 the fence design for preventing access to crops for an eight-day period between the 10 and 17
23 February 2015. We conducted all data analyses using IBM SPSS statistics for Windows
24 version 20, with significance levels set at $P < 0.05$.

25 (Figure 2)

Results

Upon discovery of the bait, baboon groups visited every day until the end of the study. A total of 161 individual baboons from at least two different groups were filmed at the enclosure site, including individuals of all age/sex classes (adult males 18%; adult females 25%; adolescents/juveniles/infants 57%). In 34 cases, individuals showed no apparent reaction to the enclosures or the bait within. Of the remaining events, 49 baboons were observed repeatedly circling the enclosure whilst glancing at the barrier and bait (Supplementary information 1), while 78 were standing or sitting at the enclosure fence and looking towards the barrier and bait (Supplementary information 2). In 80 of these 127 cases, individuals then made no further attempts to reach the bait within the enclosures. Secondary responses included 47 active attempts to reach the bait through climbing the fence or manipulating it (reaching through the mesh, pulling on the mesh, moving the rocks or digging at the base of the fence) (Table 1). Each fence height proved successful in keeping out both habituated and non-habituated wild baboons.

The habituated baboon group spent significantly longer at the bait site than non-habituated baboons (habituated group: 85.3 ± 56.7 mins; non-habituated groups: 31.3 ± 15.6 mins; $t = -2.41$, $df = 7.03$, $p = 0.047$). Habituated baboons also made significantly more attempts per visit to manipulate the structure in order to gain access to the bait (habituated group: 5.86 ± 3.97 attempts; non-habituated groups: 1.26 ± 0.52 attempts; $t = -3.06$, $df = 7.38$, $p = 0.017$). There was a trend for duration of visit to decline over time for habituated group ($r = -0.671$, $n=7$, $p = 0.099$), but not the non-habituated groups ($r = 0.673$, $n=6$, $p = 0.143$).

(Table 1)

Discussion

Game fences are widely used to mitigate human-wildlife conflict, but appropriate design, alignment and maintenance are key to their effectiveness (Kesch, Bauer & Loveridge, 2015). The results presented here suggest that crop depredation by wild primates may be reduced or even prevented through the use of relatively simple fencing techniques based on zoo exhibit design, where a barrier is placed around the top of the fence. Furthermore, a fence as low as 2m could be effective in excluding baboons of all age-sex classes.

The habituated baboons spent more time at the exclosures and attempted to reach the bait more times than the non-habituated baboons. Despite the short duration of our study, therefore, the results cannot be explained by neophobia, since animals regularly exposed to human presence spent long periods interacting with the fences and attempting to reach the food. The fact that time spent at the exclosure declined on subsequent visits suggests that the animals in the group became increasingly aware of the inaccessibility of the food.

After initial construction efforts, physical barriers require little from farmers other than maintenance costs and labour (Hill & Wallace, 2012). The barrier and overhang elements of the design are the important features which prevent the primates from climbing over. Any durable material can be used for the barrier around the top of the fence - heavy duty plastic (most common in zoos), metal and wood - and should be applicable to a broad range of species. The fence design tested here provides an adaptable, non-lethal, long-term method of protecting farmers' crops against primates. The next step will be to conduct a larger, field-scale trial using this fence design in order to further assess its utility in reducing human-primate conflict.

Acknowledgements

We thank Ian Gaigher for permission to conduct research at Lajuma and are grateful to Oldrich van Schalkwyk, Ticha Mudadi, Robert Mudua, Ephraim Rambuda, Sam Williams and Katy Williams for their help with construction. Staff at Yorkshire Wildlife Park and Trentham Monkey Forest provided information on fencing and financial support was provided by Earthwatch.

References

- Beck, A. (2010) *Electric fence induced mortality in South Africa*. (Unpublished M.Sc. thesis). South Africa: University of Witwatersrand.
- Healy, A. & Nijman, V. (2014) Pets and pests: vervet monkey intake at a specialist South African rehabilitation centre. *Anim. Welfare*. 23, 353-360.
- Hill, C.M. (2000) Conflict of interest between people and baboons: Crop raiding in Uganda. *Int. J. Primatol.* 21, 299-315.
- Hill, C.M. & Wallace, G.E. (2012) Crop protection and conflict mitigation: reducing the costs of living alongside non-human primates. *Biodivers. Conserv.* 21, 2569-2587.
- Hoffman, T.S. & O’Riain, J.M. (2012) Monkey management: using spatial ecology to understand the extent and severity of human-baboon conflict in the Cape Peninsula, South Africa. *Ecol. Soc.* 17, 13.
- Karanth, K.K., Naughton-Treves, L. & Gopalaswamy, A.M. (2013) Living with wildlife and mitigating conflicts around three Indian Protected Areas. *Environ. Manage.* 52, 1320-1332.

- 1 Kaplan, B.S. & O'Riain, M.J. (2015) Shedding light on reflective prisms as potential baboon
2 (*Papio ursinus*) deterrents in the Cape Peninsula, South Africa. *S. Afr. J. Wildl. Res.* 45, 117-
3 121.
- 4 Kesch, M.K., Bauer, D.T. & Loveridge, A.J. (2015) Break on through to the other side: The
5 effectiveness of game fencing to mitigate human-wildlife conflict. *S. Afr. J. Wildl. Res.* 45,
6 76–87.
- 7 Linkie, M., Dinata, Y., Nofrianto, A. & Leader-Williams, N. (2007) Patterns and perceptions
8 of wildlife crop raiding in and around Kerinci Seblat National Park, Sumatra. *Anim. Conserv.*
9 10, 127-135.
- 10 McGuiness, S. & Taylor, D. (2014) Farmers' perceptions and actions to decrease crop raiding
11 by forest-dwelling primates around a Rwandan forest fragment. *Hum. Dimens. Wildl.* 19,
12 179-190.
- 13 Mostert, T., Bredenkamp, G., Kloppe, H., Verwey, C., Mostert, R. & Hahn, N. (2008) Major
14 Vegetation Types of the Soutpansberg Conservancy and the Blouberg Nature Reserve, South
15 Africa. *Koedoe*. 50, 32-48.
- 16 Naughton-Treves, L. (1998) Predicting patterns of crop damage by wildlife around Kibale
17 National Park, Uganda. *Conserv. Biol.* 12, 156–168.
- 18 Saraswat, R., Sinha, A. & Radhakrishna, S. (2015) A god becomes a pest? Human-rhesus
19 macaque interactions in Himachal Pradesh, northern India. *Eur. J. Wildl. Res.* 61, 435-443.
- 20 Sitati, N.W. & Walpole, M.J. (2006) Assessing farm-based measures for mitigating human-
21 elephant conflict in Transmara District, Kenya. *Oryx*. 40, 279-286.
- 22 Thapa, S. (2010) Effectiveness of crop protection methods against wildlife damage: A case
23 study of two villages at Bardia National Park, Nepal. *Crop. Prot.* 29, 1297-1304.

- 1 Thouless, C.R. & Sakwa, J. (1995) Shocking elephants: fences and crop raiders in Laikipia
- 2 District, Kenya. *Biol. Conserv.* 72, 99-107.
- 3 Wallace, G.E. & Hill, C.M. (2012) Crop damage by primates: quantifying the key parameters
- 4 of crop-raiding events. *PLoS ONE*. 7, 1-13.
- 5

- 1 Table legends:
- 2 Table 1: Number of visits, duration of visit at the experimental site and number of active
- 3 attempts made per visit to gain access to the bait in both groups.

Visit number	Habituated baboons		Non-habituated baboons	
	Time at site (minutes)	Active attempts on bait	Time at site (minutes)	Active attempts on bait
1	162	11	6	0
2	157	0	31	2
3	22	4	46	3
4	104	3	23	0
5	35	8	34	1
6	58	10	48	0
7	59	5	-	-
Mean	85.3	5.86	31.3	1.26

4

5

1 Figure Legends:

2 Figure 1: Examples of barrier fence designs used in zoo enclosures of (a) one acre housing
3 lemurs at Yorkshire Wildlife Park, UK, and (b) 60 acres housing Barbary macaques at
4 Trentham Monkey Forest, UK.

5 Figure 2: Fence design with (a) the bracket positioned to hold the barrier away from the fence
6 mesh (b) the completed 3m high enclosure with camera trap in foreground and (c) the
7 position of bait in centre of exclosures.


8

9

1 **Figure 1**

2

3



1 **Figure 2**

